

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,798	98 03/26/2004		Emmanuel Delorme	09736-294001	7140
26191	7590	10/17/2006	. EXAMINER		INER
FISH & RI PO BOX 10		SON P.C.	DAWSON, GLENN K		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3731	
				DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summer.	10/809,798	DELORME ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
<u> </u>	Glenn K. Dawson	3731					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ma	arch 2004.						
	action is non-final.						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
		·					
 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 30-34 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
Application Papers							
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 	a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04-28-2004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te					
Patent and Trademark Office							

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8,10-12 and 17-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 8, the angle being between 100-180 contradicts claim 7 which states that the angle is between 10 and 75 degrees.

In claims 10-12,24,25 and 27, the use of preferably is indefinite. The term "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

In claim 17, the phrase "means of traction" is indefinite, in that it is unclear if the applicant intends to invoke 112 6th. It fails to follow the conventional "means for" language. Additionally, the "means for cutting" is indefinite, in that the claimed means, according to the specification is not a means to cut, rather it is a means for allowing cutting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/809,798

Art Unit: 3731

Claims 1,2,5,6,13,15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bullard-2199690.

Bullard discloses an implant in fig. 4 having a rectangular support body 11 from which emanates 2 anterior straps13, two posterior straps 12 and two middle straps positioned between the anterior and posterior straps. Each of the pair of straps has a strap, lying on one side of a sagittal plane or axis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 3,4,7,8,9,10,11,12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullard-'690.

Bullard discloses the invention as claimed with the exception of the specific lengths of the straps and the angles between the straps. Given that the Bullard device is for a facemask, the length of the straps exceeding 4-5 in. would have been an obvious modification in order to allow for proper tensioning of the mask around an average size head. As for the claimed angle ranges, it appears as if the angles between the pair of anterior or posterior straps are close to 90 degrees. Therefore, the examiner contends that widening the angle would have been a mere obvious design choice giving that the applicant failed to provide any criticality for these angles, failed to disclose the angles being for any particular purpose or to solve a problem, and the examiner contends that the prior art angles would have performed equally as well.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 30-34 are allowed.

Claims 17-29 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Art Unit: 3731

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn K. Dawson whose telephone number is 571-272-4694. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Glenn K Dawson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3731

Gkd 12 October 2006 Application/Control Number: 10/809,798

Art Unit: 3731

Page 6